## 72==8480

### **EG&G** ROCKY FLATS

TRITAL 111 1 AN HS -NCH DE OPP AD -HERA DW DODWIN R NNI BJ -RMMN L F A'Y TJ EKER EH 12 IRSY WA JESTEP A W DONALD MM ZUTO V N DLIN NB DI 20 DI JLLIVAN MT -NOOI EH INSON ED M C MCS hoft son. nnston 1 DI BDIXI -n/17 HAIX I Rec. IX CLASSIFICATION -SSIFIED THORIZED CLASSIFIER SIGNATURE applicable

office

es empt 10th

ITEM STATUE

I I closed I Parthl (177/1

CMZ PIST INITIO

\_ 0^

July 22, 1992

S2 F F 8 480

Terry A Vaeth Manager DOE, RFO

Attn J K Hartman

OPERABLE UNIT NO SPIELD SAMPLING PLAN - JMK-0709 92

Ref J K Hartman Itr (7722) to J M Kersh, EG&G Surface Water and Sediment Field Sampling Plan, July 16, 1992

In response to the above-referenced letter, EG&G Environmental Management Department (EM) has prepared the attached outline for a Field Sampling Plan (FSP) for surface water and sediment sampling for the Operable Unit Number 8 (surface water) RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) at the Rocky Flats Plant. This outline is for a FSP which combines all surface water and sediment sampling for Operable Units (OUs) 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14 into one FSP for the Protected Area (PA) using all available surface water and sediment quality data

The requested summary of all existing surface water and sediment data is not included herein, because your request provided insufficient time to prepare an adequate data summary. Etc. estimates that approximately 6 weeks would be required to produce a data summary. This activity is included in the attached schedule and cost estimation.

EM recognizes that an integrated approach to data collection for these OU investigations is necessary and EM is taking steps to ensure that integration. However, EM does not recommend formal alteration of the existing Work Plans for the PA OUs. A preliminary analysis of the costs schedules, and programs/activities that would be impacted by a formal change in scope for the PA OUs leads us to the conclusion that the marginal benefit does not warrant the substantial cost and schedule delays.

#### Change Control

Because the requested effort would constitute a major change in the scope of the OU 8 9 10 12 13, and 14 Work Plans and field activities it would be prudent to jointly agree on the changes with EG&G, DOE/RFO, USEPA, and CDH to ensure that the regulators are aware of and concur with the impacts of this proposed FSP preparation. After the scope of the changes for each OU are determined, the Plant Change Control Board would have to approve the transfer of funding from OUs 9, 10 12, 13, and 14 to OU 8 for use by Surface Water along with additional funding from Management Reserve. We estimate three to four weeks for completion of the Change Control process.

Two approaches have been considered for this effort in house FSP preparation and subcontracted FSP preparation. Both approaches would be costly (\$600K \$900k). Attached for your information is

ADMIN RECORD

ń UU10 000135

bis w

Approach

Terry A Vaeth July 22, 1992 92-RF-8480 Page 2

an estimate of the additional funding required for preparation of the Surface Water FSP for OU 8 only Additional funding (approximately 2-3 times the cost of OU 8) would be required to modify the OU 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14 Work Plans

In-house FSP preparation would be quicker and avoid the six week procurement delay required for the subcontracted preparation. However, neither of these optimistic schedules (attached) would deliver the FSP by the September 28, 1992 IAG milestone for completion of the Final Phase I RFI/RI Work Plan for OU 8. A two- to four-month delay would occur

#### Impacts of Requested FSP Preparation

Because in-house preparation of the FSP would unacceptably impact environmental protection and restoration program management capabilities and schedules, EM would use the subcontracted approach to develop the FSP Nevertheless, other IAG schedule delays would occur, such as

- 1 Changing the scheduled implementation of OU 9 and OU 10 activities in order to rewrite the agency-approved OU 9 and OU 10 Work Plans,
- 2 Changing the scheduled completion of the Surface Water, OU 12, OU 13, and OU 14 Work Plans to accommodate FSP changes, and
- 3 Delay in the scheduled start of field activities for OU 4

Additionally, preparation of several DOE deliverables would be delayed. These include

- 1 South Interceptor Ditch Soil and Sediment Erosion Study (ERD JLP 5476),
- 2 Preparation of a Surface Water and Sediment Monitoring Program Summary Document (WMED GWL 3613), and
- 3 Update of the Terminal Pond Water Quality Evaluation for Radionuclide Discharge (Section 12 of IAG)

Furthermore, pursuit of this self-imposed requirement with its attendant IAG delays could weaken DOE's position for potential IAG renegotiations

#### Current Approach

EM recognizes the necessity of an integrated approach to surface water and sediment monitoring for the PA OUs. This integration already is inherent in the interaction between the Surface Water Division (SWD) and the Remediation Programs Division (RPD) to implement surface water and sediment monitoring for RFI/RI activities.

Comprehensive PA OU monitoring can be accomplished through an integrated SWD-RPD program. This program can be developed informally by incorporating individual OU Work Plan requirements into a single program within the SWD without preparation of additional formal planning documentation.

- O

Terry A Vaeth
July 22, 1992
92-RF-8480
Page 3

To facilitate program integration, a working group consisting of SWD and RPD representatives will develop integrated monitoring schedules for the PA OUs. A chairman for this working group will be designated as a single point of contact to report schedules to DOE/RFO. The SWD-RPD interaction will continue to grow to accommodate OU monitoring and data analysis needs as OU Work Plans are prepared and implemented.

Funding for this integrated monitoring program will be shared by each OU by listing multiple charge account numbers on purchase requisitions instead of presenting major changes of scope to the Plant Change Control Board

In summary, EG&G recommends continuation of the current informal SWD-RPD interaction regarding surface water and sediment monitoring. We believe the approach described above will achieve the desired results without the cost, schedule, and programmatic impacts of changing the individual OU Work Plans.

If you have questions about the materials presented herein, please contact M B Arndt at extension 8509, B D Peterman at extension 8659, or K M Motyl at extension 8602, all of Environmental Management

M Kersh, Associate General Manager Environmental and Waste Management EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc

GAW vbs

Orig and 1 cc - T A Vaeth

Attachments As Stated (2)

CC

F R Lockhart - DOE, RFO B K Thatcher, Jr - DOE, RFO

~ · ·

# DRAFT OUTLINE FOR RFI FIELD SAMPLING PLAN FOR SURFACE WATER AND SEDIMENT DATA COLLECTION

I OBJECTIVES

ì

- 11 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE
  - A Sampling Rationale
  - B Analytical Rationale
  - C Relevant Studies of OUs located in the Protected Area
  - D Data Compilation
    - a Monitoring Programs
    - b Data Sources
    - c Application
  - E Surface Surveys
    - a Radiation Surveys
    - b Surficial Soil Surveys
    - c Drainage Patterns
- III SAMPLING DESIGN AND LOCATIONS
  - A Individual Hazardous Substance Site Overview
    - 1 Potential Contaminants of Concern
    - 2 Contaminant Fate and Transport

- B Sitewide Monitoring Program Locations
  - 1 Locations
  - 2 Data Analysis Plan
- C Event-Related Monitoring Locations
  - 1 Locations
  - 2 Sampling and Data Analysis Plan
- III D Building Sumps and Footing Drains
  - 1 Locations
  - 2 SWD Drain Study
  - 3 Sampling and Data Analysis Plan
  - E 750 Pad and 750 Culvert Monitoring
- IV SAMPLE COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS
  - A Sample Design
  - B Analytical Requirements
  - C Sample Containers and Preservation
  - D Sample Handling and Documentation
  - E Standard Operating Procedures
- V DATA MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING
- VI FIELD QC PROCEDURES

Estimated Direct Labor-Costs to	GLE Surface-V	Water and S on	maric Fi. Id Sampling	Bic J Bl
Scenario #1- In House Preparati		<del> </del>		
See land # 1 - 11 - 1 - 3c + 1 part to	./1	Cost per		
Activity	Hours	1Hour	Cost	
Activity	110.013	1		
Scoping with DOE, EPA, CDH	480	72 11	34612 8	<del></del>
Change Control	160	72 11	11537 6	
Accumulate Data	20	72 11	1442 2	
Data Cleanup/Input	160	72 11	11537 6	
Review Existing Work Plans	320	72 11	23075 2	
Analyze Data	240	72 11	17306 4	
Write Field Sampling Plan	480	72 11	34612 8	
Review Field Sampling Plan	480	72 11	34612 8	
Rewrite Field Sampling Plan	160	72 11	11537 6	
EPA, CDH Review	8	72 11	576 88	
Rewrite as per EPA,CDH	80	72 11	5768 8	
Final Submittal to EPA,CDH	40	72 11	2884 4	
		Total	189505 08	
Scenario #2Subcontractor Prep	aration			
		Cost Per		
Activity	Hours	Hour	Cost	
Scoping with DOE, EPA, CDH	480	72 11	34612 8	
Change Control	160	72 11	11537 6	
Accumulate Data	20	72 11	1442 2	
Data Cleanup/Input	160	72 11	11537 6	
Procurement	40	72 11	2884 4	
Subcontractor Preparation	800	120	96000	
Review Field Sampling Plan	480	72 11	34612 8	
Subcontractor Rewrite FSP	200	120	24000	
EPA, CDH Roview	9	72 11	576 88	
Sub Rewrite as per EPA,CDH	80	120	9600	
Final Submittal to EPA CDH	40	72 11	2884 4	
		Total	229688 68	
	<del>-</del>			
NOTE The above estimations ac	count for modi	fication of		
he existing OU8 Field Sampling			or I	
modification of Work Plans for O				<del></del>
Field Sampling Plans EG&G cos				
150,000/FTE Subcontractor c				
materials + 10% Profit and Fee		T	1	

\*

Page 1

